

Ammon E. Bundy
P.O. Box 1062
Cedar City, Utah
84720-1062

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT,
DISTRICT OF UTAH**

FILED* US Bankruptcy Court-UT
FEB 10 2025 PM12:29

Ammon Edward Bundy (Case No: 24-23530
(Chapter 7
(WILLIAM T. THURMAN
(

MOTION TO RECONSIDER DEFAULT JUDGMENT & NON-DISCHARGE

Comes now Ammon Edward Bundy seeking the court to reconsider the denial of the discharge due to default judgment.

BACKGROUND

- St. Luke's sued Mr. Bundy in this Bankruptcy Court by filing an Adversarial Complaint seeking the court not to allow Mr. Bundy to go bankrupt and discharge the \$53,000,000.00 debt that St. Luke's claims he owes them.
- St. Luke's Health System claimed they caused their Adversarial Complaint and Summons to be served on Mr. Bundy, referencing Docket Nos. 4, 6, 8 as proof of service.
- On December 12, 2024, Mr. Bundy filed a Response to St. Luke's Adversarial Complaint. (Docket No. 253)
- On December 13, 2024, St. Luke's filed an Application for Entry of Default Judgment Adjudicating their Claims against Mr. Bundy, Non-Dischargeable.

- On January 8, 2025, the court held a hearing on the matter, in which Mr. Bundy did not attend.
- On January 30, 2025, the court granted St. Luke's Application for Default Judgment against Mr. Bundy stopping him from going bankrupt and granting St. Luke's Request to a non-discharging of the \$53,000,000.00 debt.

INFORMATION

- 1) Mr. Bundy insists that he was never properly served with the St. Luke's Adversarial Proceeding Objecting to the Discharge of the debt. He has dug through the mountains of documents that St. Luke's has sent him in the bankruptcy proceeding and NOT found the document. Nor has he found the document in any email that St. Luke's attorneys have sent him. Mr. Bundy asks the court to investigate and ensure proper service was actually completed.
- 2) On December 12, 2024, Mr. Bundy responded to St. Luke Adversarial Complaint seeking the court to not discharge the debt, (Docket No. 253). In his "*Discloser and Response to the Many St. Luke's Motions Seeking to Destitute Ammon Bundy and His Family*" Mr. Bundy addressed St. Luke's claims that Mr. Bundy maliciously hurt them and concluded his response as follows:

St. Luke's filed a motion seeking the court not to allow Mr. Bundy to go bankrupt in hopes that the court would not discharge the debt so they could continue to torment and harass Mr. Bundy and his family until the \$53,000,000 is paid off. A hearing is set for January 13, 2024.

Mr. Bundy discloses, to the best of his ability, his corporate dealings, his family's financial circumstances, Abish-Husbondi Inc. transactions, other applicable disclosures and answers the questions he plead the Fifth on in the Creditors Meeting. Mr. Bundy does so with full

expectation that St. Luke's executive and attorneys and/or other entities will use this information against him and his family. However, Mr. Bundy is in hopes that by presenting this information, this court will determine that Mr. Bundy filed bankruptcy in good faith and therefore protect him and his family by discharging the approximately \$53,000,000 inconceivable debt, an astonishing debt that St. Luke's is using to harm and damage Mr. Bundy and his family. Mr. Bundy asks the court to allow him and his family a fresh start.

- 3) The court entered Mr. Bundy's Response to St. Luke's Adversarial Complaint incorrectly, misnaming the docket. Mr. Bundy has been given no access to review the docket and therefore was not aware of the misnamed docket until the clerk sent him screenshots of the docket. After reviewing the screenshots, Mr. Bundy inquired where his Response was and was informed that it was Docket No. 253, but the name did not reflect the response. The clerk acknowledged the misnamed docket and informed Mr. Bundy that it would be corrected. (See Exhibit A – Pg.8)
- 4) Mr. Bundy was completely unaware of the January 8, 2024 hearing. Mr. Bundy was made aware that it was St. Luke's duty to inform him of the hearing by the clerk of the court. After communicating with the clerk, Mr. Bundy dug through the massive pile of St. Luke's document in this case and did find notice of the hearing. It was in the middle of over 500 pages of other documents. To a layman it seems strange that the "law" would charge the opposing party (the enemy) to inform the other party of a hearing and if that party does not show up then they automatically win. A great motivation not to properly notify the opposing party or to make it hard for the party to know of the hearing. Such as sending it with hundreds of other documents or by some discrete email never used before.

On the morning of the hearing, Maryn Richmond, from the court, sent an email to Mr. Bundy's personal email account informing him of the hearing, but Mr. Bundy did not

review his personal email account until the end of that work day (the hearing was already over by the time he logged into the Zoom Meeting). He then emailed the clerk frustrated about missing the hearing and asked why the court had not given him notice. This is when the clerk informed him that it was not the court's duty to notify him, but the opposing party's duty (St. Luke). (See Exhibit A - Pg.8) To the logical person it seems like a bad idea to have the opposing party responsible for informing their adversary of a hearing that would benefit them if the party did not attend.

As a matter of record; Mr. Bundy has never missed a hearing in this proceeding intentionally.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Bundy asks the court to investigate and ensure proper service of the complaint was actually completed. Mr. Bundy did respond to St. Luke's complaint; the clerk of the court misnamed the response and has recently corrected the naming. Finally, Mr. Bundy was unaware of the most important hearing in this case and was not intentionally absent. Therefore, in the name of justice and mercy, Mr. Bundy asks the court to reconsider its ruling of non-discharge and default.

A hearing is requested if the court deems necessary.

DATED THIS DAY, the 7th of February, 2024.



Ammon Bundy

| CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this day I served a copy of the attached to:

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT, DISTRICT OF UTAH

	350 S Main St, Salt Lake City, UT 84101	[X]	USPS Mail
Mark C. Rose, Trustee	mrose@mbt-law.com	[X]	Email
Erik Stidham	efstidham@hollandhart.com	[X]	Email

DATED THIS DAY, the 7th of February, 2024.



Ammon Bundy

Exhibit A - Pg1



Calendar for Judge Thurman

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov> Wed, Jan 8, 2025 at 9:53 AM
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>, "efstidham@hollandhart.com" <efstidham@hollandhart.com>, "rfaucher_hollandhart.com" <rfaucher@hollandhart.com>, "ejtejeda@hollandhart.com" <ejtejeda@hollandhart.com>, "mrose@mbt-law.com" <MRose@mbt-law.com>, "Burne, Matthew (USTP)" <matthew.burne@usdoj.gov>

Good morning. I have attached a copy of the calendar for the matters to be heard with Judge Thurman this afternoon. I have also included the zoom information and request that you join 10 minutes prior to the hearing. Thanks.

Join ZoomGov Meeting

<https://www.zoomgov.com/j/16075238590?pwd=Y0dTl3JPSFA1RFEvZ1lkdjJjcUdUZz09>

Meeting ID: 160 7523 8590

Passcode: 9626637

Dial by your location

+1 669 254 5252 US (San Jose)

***Please be advised that this email, its contents and attachments, serves as a **courtesy** from the Court. The attached calendar is current as of the date and time stated at the top of the calendar and subject to change. For an up-to-date calendar and the Zoom hearing information for each Judge, please visit the Court's website.*

Maryn Richmond

Courtroom Deputy to the Honorable Joel T. Marker

and William T. Thurman/

Courtroom Services Supervisor

U.S. Bankruptcy Court

District of Utah

801-524-6583

Pg 2

 [1-8-25 WTT Calendar.pdf](#)
96K

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Wed, Jan 8, 2025 at 2:38 PM

This is ridiculous, this is the only notice that I received, and I just opened up this email. Does the court not have an obligation to notify me of hearings. Who was the hearing

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Wed, Jan 8, 2025 at 3:26 PM

I have included the minute entries from both hearings. The email I sent this morning was sent as a courtesy and not official notice of the hearings. There are certificates of service on the docket indicating where and when the notices were sent.

24-23530:

Minute Entry Re: [241](#) Motion for Relief From Stay Filed by Natasha D. Erickson, Natasha Erickson, M.D., Tracy W. Jungman, Tracy Jungman, N.P., Chris Roth, St Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd., St. Luke's Health System, Ltd.. Appearances: No appearance for debtor. Eric Stidham, Engels Tejeda and Robert Faucher (Natasha Erickson, M.D, Tracy Jungman, N.P, Chris Roth, St. Luke's Health System, Ltd, St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd.); Jeffrey L. Trousdale (Trustee Mark Rose). Motion granted. Pending Order Deadline due by 01/22/2025. OTF- Stidham (jst) (EOD 01/08/2025)

24-2130:

Minute Entry Re: [10](#) Motion for Default Judgment Filed by Natasha Erickson, M.D., Tracy Jungman, N.P., Chris Roth, St. Luke's Health System, Ltd., St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd.. Appearances: No appearance for debtor. Eric Stidham and Engels Tejeda (Natasha Erickson, M.D, Tracy Jungman, N.P, Chris Roth, St. Luke's Health System, Ltd, St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, Ltd.); Jeffrey L. Trousdale (Trustee Mark Rose). Motion granted. Pending Order Deadline due by 01/22/2025. OTF- Stidham (jst) (EOD 01/08/2025)

Maryn Richmond

Courtroom Deputy to the Honorable Joel T. Marker

and William T. Thurman/

Courtroom Services Supervisor

U.S. Bankruptcy Court

District of Utah

801-524-6583

Pg 3

From: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2025 2:39 PM
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
Subject: Re: Calendar for Judge Thurman

CAUTION - EXTERNAL:

CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated outside the Judiciary. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Wed, Jan 8, 2025 at 4:09 PM

So you are saying that the court has no obligation to notify me of when a hearing is scheduled?

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Wed, Jan 8, 2025 at 5:01 PM

Maryn,
Will you please send me the orders as soon as possible by mail or preferably email. The USPS mail coming from the court usually has a yellow return mail label on it and does not show up for a couple weeks after it has been sent.

Thanks

PS. Even though I'm frustrated by the lack of real notice I'm grateful you gave me a courtesy email.

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Thu, Jan 9, 2025 at 10:42 AM

Good morning and thank you for your email. As for the orders, the Court ordered St. Luke's to send copies of the proposed orders to you. You should be receiving them in the mail. I would be happy to email you the orders once they have been entered on the docket. I have included a copy of the most recent dockets for both the main case and adversary proceeding for your reference. If there are additional documents you would like me to email I would be happy to do so.

In response to your question about notice, how much notice, the methods for giving notice and who is responsible for giving notice is spelled out in federal law, federal rules of procedure, and our local rules. In most instances, the party seeking relief is responsible for noticing. Additionally, it is not the Clerk's Office but the Court that determines whether notice was proper in every matter that comes before it. In my prior email I referred to notices and certificates of

Pg 4

service for the hearings that were held yesterday. I have attached the PDFs of those two notices stating where notice was sent.

I hope this answers your question. Feel free to reach out with any further questions. Thanks and have a great day.

4 attachments

-  **24-23530 Docket.pdf**
861K
-  **24-2130 Docket.pdf**
178K
-  **24-23530 Notice and COS for Motion for Relief from Stay.pdf**
148K
-  **24-2130 Notice and COS for Motion for Default.pdf**
122K

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Thu, Jan 9, 2025 at 1:30 PM

Thank you!

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Mon, Jan 13, 2025 at 4:11 PM

I have not received those orders from St. Luke's. Would you be willing to send them to me?

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Mon, Jan 13, 2025 at 4:22 PM

They have not been filed on the docket yet. It is my understanding that they were going to send them to you in the mail and then would be filing them on the docket. I can email them to you as soon as they are filed.

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Mon, Jan 13, 2025 at 6:57 PM

Ok, thank you.

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Wed, Jan 15, 2025 at 6:38 PM

Maryn,
I am concerned that the court has not received the many motions and responses that I have sent in. I have not been given permission to view the docket and therefore have been in the dark as to what the court has received and what

Pg 5

it has not. Multiple times I have sent documents to the court and they were returned. One response was returned 2 months after I sent it. This has happened with both the USPS and USP. One explanation I received by the court was that the courthouse is being remodeled and the carriers have had trouble delivering. The court asked me to send any correspondence to a second address in which I complied. My request here is that you verify that the court has received the following motions and responses.

Sincerely,
Ammon Bundy

OBJECTION TO SECOND MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE TO FILE A COMPLAINT OBJECTING TO DEBTOR'S DISCHARGE - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 4th day of January, 2025.

DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE TO THE MANY ST. LUKE'S MOTIONS SEEKING TO DESTITUTE AMMON BUNDY AND HIS FAMILY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 10th of October, 2024.

RESPONSE ST. LUKE'S CREDITOR'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM BANKRUPTCY STAY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 20th of December, 2024.

MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW REQUEST TO SEAL LISA BUNDY'S MEDICAL RECORDS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 10th of October, 2024.

RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES CREDITORS' OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIMED EXEMPTIONS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 1st of October, 2024.

MOTIONS TO SEAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO LISA BUNDY'S MEDICAL RECORDS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 3rd of December, 2024.

MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA FOR LISA M. BUNDY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 7th of October, 2024.

RESPONSE TO MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE TO FILE A COMPLAINT OBJECTING TO DEBTOR'S DISCHARGE UNDER 11 U.S.C. 727 - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 1st of October, 2024.

RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES COMPLAINING TO THE COURT ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO SERVE AMMON BUNDY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 29th of October, 2024.

Pg 6

**RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES MOTION TO COMPEL LISA BUNDY'S COMPLIANCE WITH
RULE 2004 SUBPOENA**

MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 21th of November, 2024.

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Thu, Jan 16, 2025 at 2:54 PM

Good afternoon. I went through the docket and verified that these documents were received by the court. I have included the corresponding docket numbers for your reference. Thanks and have a great day.

Docket #306- OBJECTION TO SECOND MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE TO FILE A COMPLAINT OBJECTING TO DEBTOR'S DISCHARGE - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 4th day of January, 2025.

Docket #253- DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE TO THE MANY ST. LUKE'S MOTIONS SEEKING TO DESTITUTE AMMON BUNDY AND HIS FAMILY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 10th of October, 2024.

Docket #258- RESPONSE ST. LUKE'S CREDITOR'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM BANKRUPTCY STAY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 20th of December, 2024.

Docket #252- MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW REQUEST TO SEAL LISA BUNDY'S MEDICAL RECORDS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 10th of October, 2024.

Docket #142- RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES CREDITORS' OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIMED EXEMPTIONS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 1st of October, 2024.

Docket #195- MOTIONS TO SEAL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO LISA BUNDY'S MEDICAL RECORDS - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 3rd of December, 2024.

Docket #163- MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA FOR LISA M. BUNDY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 7th of October, 2024.

Docket #143- RESPONSE TO MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE TO FILE A COMPLAINT OBJECTING TO DEBTOR'S DISCHARGE UNDER 11 U.S.C. 727 - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 1st of October, 2024.

Pg 7

**Docket #257- RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES COMPLAINING TO THE COURT ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE
TO SERVE AMMON BUNDY - MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 29th of October, 2024.**

**Docket #189- RESPONSE TO ST. LUKES MOTION TO COMPEL LISA BUNDY'S COMPLIANCE
WITH RULE 2004 SUBPOENA MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 21th of November, 2024.**

Maryn Richmond
Courtroom Deputy to the Honorable Joel T. Marker
and William T. Thurman/
Courtroom Services Supervisor
U.S. Bankruptcy Court
District of Utah
801-524-6583

From: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 6:38 PM
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
Subject: Re: Calendar for Judge Thurman

CAUTION - EXTERNAL:

CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated outside the Judiciary. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>
To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Thu, Jan 16, 2025 at 5:14 PM

Thank you

Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Mon, Jan 20, 2025 at 8:15 AM

Pg 8

To: Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>

Maryn,
I would like to receive some clarification about docket #253. It is entered on the court docket as "Response to (related document(s):177 Motion to Compel, 179 Motion to Compel, 181 Motion to Compel, 183 Motion to Compel) Filed by Ammon Edward Bundy, (amo) (EOD 12/17/2024)" In our earlier email correspondence you said docket #253 is my response that is titled "*DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE TO THE MANY ST. LUKE'S MOTIONS SEEKING TO DESTITUTE AMMON BUNDY AND HIS FAMILY- MAILED TO COURT - DATED THIS DAY, the 10th of October, 2024.*". So, is docket #253 a response to a motion to compel or my response to the many St. Lukes motions? Additionally, if docket #253 is my response to the many St. Luke's motions why is it not filed correctly on the docket? Also, if this is my response to many St. Luke's motions then why was it filed on December 17, 2024 when it was sent to the court via mail on October 10, 2024 over two month earlier. This information is very important because my RESPONSE TO THE MANY MOTIONS SEEKING TO DESTITUTE AMMON BUNDY AND HIS FAMILY is my response to St. Lukes Objection to Discharge that was entered in as a default for no response. If the court read my response then it would know that the entire document was in response to the many claims St. Luke's made in their objections to the discharge. Especially in the conclusion when it states, "*Mr. Bundy is in hope that by presenting this information, this court will determine that Mr. Bundy filed bankruptcy in good faith and therefore protect him and his family by discharging the approximately \$53,000,000 inconceivable debt, an astonishing debt that St. Luke's is using to harm and damage Mr. Bundy and his family. Mr. Bundy asks the court to allow him and his family a fresh start.*"

Please, let me know what docket #253 is?

Thank you,
Ammon Bundy

Maryn Richmond <Maryn_Richmond@utb.uscourts.gov>
To: Ammon Bundy <aebundy@bundyfarms.com>

Tue, Jan 21, 2025 at 12:07 PM

Docket #253 is your "Disclosure and Response to the Many St. Luke's Motions Seeking to Destitute Ammon Bundy and His Family" and the Court will correct the text of the docket entry to reflect that. The document was filed on the docket the day the Court received it in the mail.